

Advertising

66 FIFTH AVENUE NEW YORK, N. Y. 10019 TELEPHONE: WUDSON 6-0600

COPY DEPT.

PUBLICATION _____

PRODUCT _____

ISSUE 3/14/68

Second in a series from The Tobacco Institute, in response to mounting requests for the little-known 'other side' of the smoking controversy

Does laboratory evidence

really support

the case against smoking?

~~You may recall reading, not so long ago, about certain "mouse" experiments. Laboratory proof for the charges against cigarettes seemed to be at hand, and the experiments were widely publicized.~~

They are no longer publicized.

The "mouse" experiments, it turned out, did not support the case against smoking.

SUBHEAD:

Smoking Mice

Researchers ran many kinds of tests. One famous series of experiments placed white mice in special inhalation chambers. Here, the animals "breathed" cigarette smoke for days, weeks, and months.

How many cases of malignant, ~~human-type~~ lung cancer of the type resulted? attributed by some to cigarette smoking resulted?

None. It has never been produced with cigarette smoke.

Such cancers have been produced by making mice, after exposure to a virus, inhale synthesized smog. They have never been produced with cigarette smoke.

and induction of synthesis

They have been unable, published
and obtained a satisfactory proof of the
charges against cigarettes.

1005109136

British Mice

Some evidence, in fact, points the other way.

An experiment in Britain studied mice in an environment where they "breathed" cigarette smoke for eighteen months. These mice were compared with unexposed mice for some time afterwards.

The astonishing finding: the "smoking" mice actually lived longer than the mice not exposed to smoke.

Painted Mice

Much has been made of the fact that painting smoke condensate ("tar") on the backs of mice has caused some cases of skin cancer in the laboratory.

Still, these laboratory and clinical experiments hardly advance the case against smoking. After all, the doses used in some of these experiments were equal to smoking 100,000 cigarettes a day.

Moreover, other experiments have demonstrated that skin cancers could also be produced in the animals by using sugar, vegetable oil, tomato juice, and even distilled water.

You can see why one critic of the "mouse" experiments has called them the use of the wrong material, in the wrong form, in the wrong concentration, under the wrong circumstances, in the wrong animal.

Apart from mice, what?

So much for mouse experiments. Other laboratory and clinical attempts to incriminate smoking have been similarly baffled.

Researchers reasoned, for instance, that if cigarette smoke causes cancer, then the disease should increase proportionately in all areas of the body affected by smoke. It has been found that this is not the case. There has been no such increase in cancer of the mouth, nose, trachea, larynx or other parts of the respiratory system.

You can see why it has appropriately been said of the mouse experiments that they involve the wrong material, etc.

*Harris & Higgins
They cannot be painted*

have been estimated as being

produced cancer in mice by

*using sugar
in water,
vegetable oil,
tomato juice -
other substances
usually considered
harmless.*

*HOCKETT
Industry cannot
Raise for Council top
HTA - he will us
problem*

lung?

Other laboratory

[afforded to]

1005109137

Even in the lung, cancer does not appear where it might be expected. Most cases occur farther out in the lung where the concentration of smoke is much less.

Studies of so-called "pre-cancerous changes" in the respiratory system of some smokers have shown that the same "changes" are also found in non-smokers, and even in children. They are often found in the trachea, where cancer is rare. Even more important, no one has ever demonstrated that they actually do lead to cancer.

a medical parity, as they are in the lung

No evidence
"NO VALID EXPERIMENTAL EVIDENCE"

One medical authority summed it up in testimony before the U.S. Senate:

"There is no valid experimental evidence confirming the smoking-lung cancer theory."

Who's quoted?

As bluntly as that.

Without scientific proof or evidence, the case against smoking is supported only by statistical associations. And these have been, in themselves, seriously questioned by doctors, scientists and statisticians.

experimented / laboratory / adequate or convincing
stat
with other doctors and other experts

The statistical case is well worth a close look. You may find its weaknesses unexpectedly surprising, in that it is the mainstay of the charges against smoking.

It will be the subject of another report in this series.

In position before documented?

For further information on any of the facts above, for documentation and sources of information, you are invited to write to:

The Tobacco Institute
1735 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C.

any specific
Members?

This is the position paper

For a further discussion, read "THE CIGARETTE CONTROVERSY". Write to The Tobacco Institute for your free copy.

1005109138